

Remarks

Claim 13, previously rejected, has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 18, and the Examiner previously indicated claim 18 is allowable ("Claims 1-10, 18, 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form..."). Thus the amendment renders claim 13 and its dependent claims (14-17) allowable.

Claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-10, 19 and 20 were previously indicated as allowable.

Claims 8 and 16 have been amended to overcome the § 112 rejection. This amendment is to clarify the wording of the claims and is not related to issues of patentability.

Claim 11 was amended to include the sub-well limitation, thus distinguishing claim 11 from the prior art. Claim 12 is dependent on claim 11. It is believed that claims 11 and 12 are now allowable.

Claim 21 is newly presented but is dependent on an allowable base claim.

In the office action the Examiner set forth numerous obviousness-type double patenting rejections. A terminal disclaimer and fee are enclosed..

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of May, 2004.



Daniel P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 36,600
PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 532-1234